arXiv:1702.06430v1 [hep-th] 21 Feb 2017

Matrix Model of QCD: Edge Localized Glue Balls and Phase Transitions

Nirmalendu Acharyya [*1] and A. P. Balachandran [†2,3]

[1]Optique Nonlinéaire Théorique, Université libre de Bruxelles (U.L.B.), CP 231, Belgium
[2]Physics Department, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13244-1130, U.S.A.
[3]Institute of Mathematical Sciences, C.I.T Campus, Chennai, TN 600113, India

Abstract

In a matrix model of pure $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory, boundaries emerge in the space of $\mathrm{Mat}_3(\mathbb{R})$ and the Hamiltonian requires boundary conditions. We show the existence of edge localized glueball states which can have negative energies. These edge levels can be lifted to positive energies if the gluons acquire a London-like mass. This suggests a new phase of QCD with an incompressible bulk.

1 Introduction

Non-abelian gauge theories of high energy physics are based on compact gauge groups. They generally contain a Lie group like $SU(3)$ or $SU(2)$ which modulo their discrete centres are simple.

In an important paper, Gribov [1] showed that in all such theories, the Coulomb gauge does not fully eliminate the gauge freedom: there are gauge related copies of the connection in this gauge. It was later proved by Singer [2] and by Narasimhan and Ramadas [3] that there exists in fact no condition to eliminate the gauge ambiguities, the gauge bundle on the configuration space being twisted.

Narasimhan and Ramadas, in their work on $SU(2)$, reduced the considerations to a family of connections parametrised by 3 real matrices. The essential topological complexities of exact QCD are already captured by this model. Here too the appropriate $SU(2)/\mathbb{Z}_2 = SO(3)$ bundle is twisted, the twist being inherited from the full QCD.

[*]nacharyy@ulb.ac.be
[†]balachandran38@gmail.com

The work of Narasimhan and Ramadas can be extended to $SU(3)$ and other non-abelian groups. That is because it is based on Maurer-Cartan forms which have a certain universal character.

In two previous papers by Balachandran, Queiroz and Vaidya [4,5], the Hamiltonian formalism for these matrices as configuration spaces was deduced from QCD. The glueball spectrum for $SU(2)$ gauge group was found to have a mass gap. The presence of this gap is often regarded as a signal for confinement. They also discussed QCD $\theta-$angle, constructed the Dirac operator and gave estimates for glueball masses using variational methods.

In this paper, we extend this work to certain "singular" boundaries of the 3×3 matrix model and the special states localised at these boundaries. Such boundary states exist also for $SU(3)$ and other gauge groups, being a reflection of states localised at degenerate connections in exact QCD.

In the space $\mathrm{Mat}_3(\mathbb{R})$ of 3×3 real matrices, boundaries and stratification emerge as follows. A matrix $M \in \mathrm{Mat}_3(\mathbb{R})$ has the singular value decomposition

$$M = LDR^T, \qquad L, R \in SO(3) \tag{1.1}$$

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_3 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3 \geq 0. \tag{1.2}$$

When all the a_i's are unequal, $a_i \neq a_j$ if $i \neq j$, we get the open and dense stratum. At the boundaries, either a pair of a_i or all a_i are equal.

The boundaries $\partial\mathcal{D}$ of the spatial manifold $\mathcal{D}$ have physical consequences. The Laplace and Dirac operators are subject to boundary conditions at $\partial\mathcal{D}$ for self-adjointness. The latter can induce anomalies [6]. They can also create edge-localised states [7] which are of particular interest for topological insulators as discussed previously [8]. For the Dirac operator, when the boundary conditions are of APS type, they lead to the η-invariant which has an impact on axial anomaly [9]. Such boundary conditions can also make or break supersymmetry or BRST invariance [10, 11].

These known results are the incentives to study the boundaries of $\mathrm{Mat}_3(\mathbb{R})$. As for spatial manifolds with boundaries, here too the Hamiltonian requires boundary conditions, and can create "edge" states localised near the boundaries. They are expected to be novel glueball states implying the existence of new phases of QCD. This work focuses on these aspects. It can be extended to $\mathrm{Mat}_8(\mathbb{R})$ which is appropriate for colour $SU(3)$.

We here confirm first that there do exist such edge states. The energy of these edge states can be negative. Such states are physical only if the gluons acquire mass. This suggests the possibility of new phases in which the gluons becomes massive just as the photon acquires a London mass in a superconductor. When matter fields are coupled to the matrix model, similar edge states emerge naturally [12]. Here, we demonstrate that the emergence of such edge states is due to the presence of nontrivial boundary conditions on $\mathrm{Mat}_3(\mathbb{R})$. Further these "superconducting" phases share features with earlier models of quark-gluon plasma [13, 14].

The first step in the analysis is the partial wave decomposition of wave functions $\Psi : \mathrm{Mat}_3(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{C}$ with regard to the two $SO(3)$'s appearing in (1.1). The Laplacian for the matrix model then separates as shown by Iwai [15]. We discuss this in section 2 where we also clarify the meaning of the transformation $M \to L'MR'^T$, $L', R' \in SO(3)$ which commutes with

the Laplacian. In this manner, we arrive at the $SO(3)_L \times SO(3)_R$ invariant S-wave sector of glueballs.

The eigenvalue problem is singular at the boundaries where two or more a_i becomes equal. It is of the same kind as the singularity at $r = 0$ of radial eigenvalue problem on $\mathbb{R}^d$ (d=dimension). In the latter, as is known, it appears in the volume form $r^{(d-1)} dr d\Omega_{S_{(d-1)}}$ which becomes zero at $r = 0$. We can transfer the $r^{(d-1)}$ factor to the Hamiltonian. Then the new volume form $dr d\Omega_{S_{(d-1)}}$ is well behaved at the origin, while the transformed radial Laplacian

$$-\partial_r^2 + \frac{(d-3)(d-1)}{4r^2} + \frac{l(l+d-2)}{r^2} \tag{1.3}$$

has acquired the singular potential $\frac{(d-3)(d-1)}{4r^2}$ for $d \neq 1, 3$. For all other values of d, the singularity at $r = 0$ calls for special boundary conditions which can be found using Weyl's "limit point-limit circle" theorems [16]. Notice that for $1 < d < 3$, the potential is attractive whereas for all other values, it is repulsive. In a similar way, in our glueball problem, a potential with singularities of the form $\prod_{i>j}(a_i^2 - a_j^2)^{-1}$ appears. Fortunately, they are amenable to Weyl's approach. These matters are discussed in section 3 where we also bring the eigenvalue problem to a stage which can be treated by variational methods.

Section 4 reports on the variational calculation. The singularity at the boundary $\partial \mathrm{Mat}_3(\mathbb{R})$ is of the "limit circle" type so that the self-adjoint extensions are characterised by the phases $e^{i\theta}$. The Dirichlet boundary condition has $e^{i\theta} = -1$, while the Neumann boundary condition has $e^{i\theta} = 1$. For the Robin boundary conditions which are near Dirichlet, just as the spatial boundary, edge localised glueball states exist. For certain choice of the boundary condition, these states has positive energy, while some leads to negative energy. In section 5, we give the interpretation of the negative energy states in terms of a new QCD phase with an incompressible bulk, in close analogy to superconductivity on a spatial domain $\mathcal{D}$ [7]. In the latter, there are localised low-lying states at the boundary $\partial\mathcal{D}$, whereas the bulk states are gapped. In the new QCD phase, the gluons are massive. Such masses can be generated when matter fields are coupled to the matrix model [12].

In the final section 6, we highlight certain observations of Iwai [15][1]. Namely, the Hamiltonian does not have a divergent centrifugal barrier term near the boundaries when the wave functions transform non-trivially under $SO(3)_L$ or $SO(3)_R$. This is in striking contrast to the Laplacian on $\mathbb{R}^d$ which *does* have a centrifugal potential for non-zero angular momentum, that is for non-singlet $SO(d)$ representations. That suggests that edge states exist regardless of $SO(3)_L$ or $SO(3)_R$ angular momentum. The QCD potential from angular momentum and colour excitations does depend on these excitations and change with $SO(3)_{L,R}$ representations (although it is finite when the boundary is approached) so that the glueball excitations need not be degenerate.

In a different project [17], the glueball masses in the same matrix model have been estimated using the harmonic oscillator eigenstates. Low lying glueball spectra obtained there are remarkably similar to the ones from lattice QCD.

[1] Their significance was pointed out to us by Sachindeo Vaidya

2 The Hamiltonian and its Partial Wave Reduction

The origin of the matrix model for QCD comes from the well-known "Gribov ambiguity" [1, 2]. We explain how that is so in this section focusing on the SU(2) gauge group. We consider $SU(2)$ and not $SU(3)$ as our numerical work has been on $SU(2)$. Theoretical considerations on $SU(3)$ can be found in [4, 5].

The "Gribov ambiguity" can be summarised in the statement that the gauge bundle in any non-abelian gauge theory which involves a compact semi-simple Lie group is twisted. Therefore, there is no global gauge fixing condition in any such theory.

The full space of connections on $\mathbb{R}^d$ in any gauge theory is infinite dimensional. Narsimhan and Ramadas [3] proved that the exact gauge theory twist is reflected in the following finite-dimensional submanifold of connections parametrised by matrices:

$$\Omega = \mathrm{Tr}\left[\frac{\tau_a}{2}u^{-1}du\right]M_{ab}\tau_b \tag{2.1}$$

Here we consider spatial dimension 3 and $SU(2)$ gauge group and τ_a's are Pauli matrices. M is a real 3×3 matrix and u is given by the Skyrme ansatz [18]:

$$u(\vec{x}) = \cos\theta(r) + i\tau_i\hat{x}_i\sin\theta(r), \qquad \theta(0)=\pi, \qquad \theta(\infty)=0, \qquad \vec{x}\in\mathbb{R}^3, \qquad r=|\vec{x}|, \tag{2.2}$$

θ being a monotonic function of r.

There are two group actions of interest on M:

1. The first comes from the colour $SU(2)$ transformation

$$\Omega \to g\Omega g^{-1}, \qquad g\in SU(2). \tag{2.3}$$

Since

$$g\tau_b g^{-1} = \tau_c Adg_{cb} \tag{2.4}$$

where $g\to Adg$ is the 3×3 adjoint representation of $SU(2)$, the transformations

$$M \to M Adg^T \tag{2.5}$$

are $SU(2)$ colour transformations. Observables are all colour singlets.

Only global colour acts on Ω: it is partially "gauge fixed" to eliminate space-time dependent transformations.

2. Under the transformation

$$u\to us, \qquad s\in SU(2), \tag{2.6}$$

we have

$$u^{-1}du \to s^{-1}(u^{-1}du)s. \tag{2.7}$$

Or since

$$s\tau_b s^{-1} = \tau_c Ads_{cb}, \qquad Ads\in SO(3), \tag{2.8}$$

this gives the transformation

$$M \to AdsM. \tag{2.9}$$

Now $s^{-1}(u^{-1}du)s$ is also achieved by the transformation

$$u \to s^{-1}us \tag{2.10}$$

and that, as (2.2) shows, is a spatial rotation. Hence, (2.9) corresponds to spatial rotation.

We use [4, 5] for the matrix model Hamiltonian and the transformation properties of the states. The Hamiltonian is invariant under colour $SU(2)$ and spatial rotations.

The Hamiltonian: The exact pure Yang-Mills action is

$$S_{QCD} = -\frac{1}{2g^2}\int d^4x F_{\mu\nu}(x)F^{\mu\nu}(x), \qquad F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu + [A_\mu, A_\nu]. \tag{2.11}$$

It gives the gluon Hamiltonian

$$H_{QCD} = \frac{1}{2}\int d^3x \mathrm{Tr}\left[g^2 E_i E_i - \frac{1}{g^2}F_{ij}^2\right], \tag{2.12}$$

where the electric field E_i is conjugate to A_i.

The matrix model Hamiltonian follows from (2.12). We introduce

$$E_{i\alpha} = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial M_{i\alpha}} \tag{2.13}$$

as conjugate operators to $M_{i\alpha}$ and write the matrix model Hamiltonian

$$H = -\tfrac{1}{R}\left[\frac{g^2}{2}\sum_{i,\alpha}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial M_{i\alpha}^2} + V(M)\right], \qquad V(M) = -\frac{1}{2g^2}\mathrm{Tr}F_{ij}^2. \tag{2.14}$$

The constant R with length scale has been introduced for dimensional reasons.

The curvature F_{ij} is

$$\begin{array}{l} F_{ij} = (d\Omega + \Omega\wedge\Omega)(iX_i, iX_j), \\ X_i = \text{angular momentum generators.} \end{array} \tag{2.15}$$

Since the Skyrme ansatz effectively works on S^3, X_i's replace the spatial translations in F_{ij}. This curvature is computed in [4, 5]:

$$F_{ij} = i\epsilon_{ijk}M_{k\alpha}\frac{\tau_\alpha}{2} - i\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}M_{i\alpha}M_{j\beta}\frac{\lambda_\gamma}{2}, \qquad i = 1,2,3, \quad \alpha = 1,2,3. \tag{2.16}$$

In this way, we get

$$V(M) = \frac{1}{2g^2}[M_{ia}M_{ia} - \epsilon_{ijk}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}M_{i\alpha}M_{j\beta}M_{k\gamma} + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{\alpha_1\beta_1\gamma}\epsilon_{\alpha_2\beta_2\gamma}M_{i\alpha_1}M_{j\beta_1}M_{i\alpha_2}M_{j\beta_2}. \tag{2.17}$$

The scalar product of the functions Ψ for the Hilbert space on which H operates is

$$(\Psi_1, \Psi_2) = \int \prod_{i,\alpha} dM_{i\alpha}\bar{\Psi}_1(M)\Psi_2(M) \tag{2.18}$$

Using the singular value decomposition

$$M = RAS^T, \qquad A \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_3 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3 \geq 0, \tag{2.19}$$

we get the simple expression

$$V(M) = \frac{1}{2g^2}\left[(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2) - 6a_1a_2a_2 + (a_1^2a_2^2 + a_2^2a_3^2 + a_3^2a_1^2)\right] \tag{2.20}$$

The next step for $SU(2)$ or more precisely SO(3), is separation of variables for $SO(3)_L \times SO(3)_R$ which act on the left and right of M respectively. This work has been done by Iwai [15]. As he shows, if $d\Omega_{L,R}$ are the $SO(3)$-invariant volume forms of $SO(3)_{L,R}$, then

$$\begin{gathered}\textstyle\prod_{i,\alpha} dM_{i\alpha} = \phi(a) \prod_i da_i d\Omega_L d\Omega_R, \qquad \phi(a) = (a_1^2 - a_2^2)(a_2^2 - a_3^2)(a_1^2 - a_3^2) \geq 0, \\ d\Omega_{L,R} = SO(3)_{L,R} \text{ invariant volume forms.}\end{gathered} \tag{2.21}$$

Also, when acting on $SO(3)_{L,R}$ singlet wave functions, which are our subject of numerical investigations, the Laplacian $-\sum \frac{\partial^2}{\partial M_{i\alpha}^2}$ reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} -\sum \frac{\partial^2}{\partial M_{i\alpha}^2} \to \Delta \;\; = \;\; & -\left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial a_1^2} + 2a_1\left(\frac{1}{a_1^2 - a_2^2} + \frac{1}{a_1^2 - a_3^2}\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial a_1}\right. \\ & + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial a_1^2} + 2a_2\left(\frac{1}{a_2^2 - a_1^2} + \frac{1}{a_2^2 - a_3^2}\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial a_2} \\ & \left. + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial a_3^2} + 2a_3\left(\frac{1}{a_3^2 - a_1^2} + \frac{1}{a_3^2 - a_2^2}\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial a_3}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

Since, $d\Omega_{L,R}$ only supply overall factors in the scalar product of singlets, we will ignore them.

It is convenient to change the volume form to $\prod da_i$ by changing Δ to

$$\frac{2R}{g^2}\hat{H}_0 = \sqrt{\phi}\Delta\sqrt{\phi} \tag{2.23}$$

and hence H to

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + V(M). \tag{2.24}$$

The expression for $\frac{2R}{g^2}\hat{H}_0$ is

$$\frac{2R}{g^2}\hat{H}_0 = -\sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial a_i^2} + U(a) \tag{2.25}$$

$$U(a) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\frac{\partial^2\phi}{\partial a_i^2}\right)(a) - \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1}{\phi}\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial a_i}\right)^2(a), \tag{2.26}$$

In more explicit form,

$$\begin{aligned} U(a) \;\; &= \;\; \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{(a_1 - a_2)^2} + \frac{1}{(a_1 + a_2)^2} + \frac{1}{(a_1 - a_3)^2} + \frac{1}{(a_2 - a_3)^2} + \frac{1}{(a_1 + a_3)^2} + \frac{1}{(a_2 + a_3)^2}\right) \\ &= \;\; \frac{a_1^2 + a_2^2}{(a_1^2 - a_2^2)^2} + \frac{a_1^2 + a_3^2}{(a_1^2 - a_3^2)^2} + \frac{a_2^2 + a_3^2}{(a_2^2 - a_3^2)^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

3 On Boundary Conditions

The new potential $U(a)$ is singular as $a_i \to a_j$ due to the stratified structure of the matrix orbit space. The bulk corresponds to the orbits of irreducible gauge fields, whereas the boundary contains the orbits of reducible gauge fields. In the pure gauge theory, there are natural boundary conditions for the quantum Hamiltonian. When the gauge theory is coupled to matter fields, some more general conditions can be considered see e.g. [19–26]. Therefore, one needs to consider the possibility of more general boundary conditions to treat these singularities.

The analogous problem for boundary conditions in one variable was treated by Weyl [27] and goes by the name of "limit point, limit circle" theorems [16, 28]. The generalisation of Weyl's approach to several variables is due to Harishchandra and is described by Knapp [29][2].

Fortunately, because of certain simplicities, we can treat the domain of self-adjointness of (2.25) without the full machinery in Knapp. The approach we follow is due to [23–26, 30].

The general method here for finding all boundary conditions is as follows. Let us consider the asymptotic zero modes Ψ_{azm} of $\hat{H}_0$ that are square integrable in a neighborhood of the singularities of the effective potential, that is

$$\hat{H}_0 \Psi_{azm} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\Lambda^2}\right), \tag{3.1}$$

with

$$\int_{\phi(a)\leq\Lambda} \prod_i da_i |\Psi_{azm}(a)|^2 < \infty, \tag{3.2}$$

$\Lambda \ll 1$ being an arbitrary small cutoff. In general there is an infinity of such asymptotic zero-modes [24]. However, they can be parametrized by separation of variables in a way similar to what is done in the one dimensional case (1.3). We can choose a system of coordinates on the surface $\phi(a) = \Lambda$ and one extra *radial* coordinate given by $\phi(a)^{\frac{1}{3}}$. The Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$ then splits into two parts: one *radial* term H_ϕ and one *angular* term H_Λ. The asymptotic zero modes can then be split according to the different eigenvalues $\lambda_n \geq 0$ of angular part. Our focus here is on the zero eigenvalue, and hence on the zero mode of $\hat{H}_0$. In this case there are the two independent zero modes

$$\Psi_1 = \sqrt{\phi}; \quad \Psi_2 = \sqrt{\phi}\log\phi. \tag{3.3}$$

Notice the asymptotic zero modes corresponding to the higher modes Δ_Λ vanish at the singular points where $\phi(a)$ vanishes and do not require extra parameters to fix the boundary condition. In some sense the simple structure of the singularity simplifies the analysis of the boundary conditions [24].

We can understand the origin of zero modes very simply before the transformation (2.23): they are just the constant function and $\log\phi$. They correspond to the $\sqrt{r}$ and the $\sqrt{r}\log r$ zero modes of (1.3) for $l = 0$ and $d = 2$.

From the boundary condition it follows that the functions in the domain of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$ have an asymptotic behavior similar of Ψ_θ, i.e.

$$\Psi \sim \cos\theta\ \Psi_1 + \sin\theta\ \Psi_2 \quad \text{as } \phi(a) \to 0. \tag{3.4}$$

[2] We thank Professor M.S. Narasimhan who helped us in understanding this work and for these references.

In fact it is the relative coefficient $\tan\theta$ (which can also be infinite) between Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 is what matters.

Equation (3.4) refers only to the behaviour of Ψ as $\phi(a) \to 0$. For large a_i and/or large $\phi(a)$, square integrability requires that $\Psi \to 0$. For example, the wave function

$$\Psi = (\Psi_1 + \tan\theta\Psi_2)e^{-\phi(a)\sum_{i=1}^3 a_i^2}. \tag{3.5}$$

which is globally defined for any a with $\phi(a) > 0$ belongs also to the domain of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$.

As emphasised, these zero modes appear naturally in the theory and there is nothing mysterious about them. Working with the volume form $\phi(a)\prod_i da_i$ instead of $\prod_i da_i$, Ψ_1 corresponds to a constant zero mode and of course, it is a zero mode of the Laplacian. The numerical computation to glueball masses in [17] corresponds to a variational calculation around this mode which then brings in also non-constant functions. Therefore, that is the $\theta = 0$ case.

When nothing special happens at the $\phi(a) = 0$ boundary, we only consider Ψ_1. Instead if we consider both Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 with a nonzero value θ, there can be nontrivial physical effects at the $\phi(a) = 0$ boundary, like emergence of edge localized states. We demonstrate these in the following section.

4 Edge States: Numerical Results

In this section, we calculate an upper bound of the ground state energy of

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + V(M) \tag{4.1}$$

(where $\hat{H}_0$ and $V(M)$ are defined in (2.25) and (2.20) respectively) using variational calculation and show the existence of edge states as described in the previous section.

For certain choices of θ to be discussed below, energy becomes negative making the system unstable. Such θ have to be rejected, without further physical inputs. Of course, as we are doing only a variational calculation, we can only numerically check that the energy is positive. That carries the uncertainties of numerical estimates.

As a variational ansatz for the ground state, we consider

$$\zeta_k = (\Psi_1 + \tan\theta\Psi_2)e^{-k\phi(a)\sum_{i=1}^3 a_i^2}, \qquad k > 0 \tag{4.2}$$

which has the asymptotic behaviour (3.4) and is square integrable in $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3 \geq a_3 \geq 0$. Here, k is the variational parameter.

For fixed values of $\tan\theta$, we numerically compute

$$E(k) = \frac{\displaystyle\int_0^\infty da_1 \int_0^{a_1} da_2 \int_0^{a_2} da_3\ \zeta_k^\dagger(\hat{H}\zeta_k)}{\displaystyle\int_0^\infty da_1 \int_0^{a_1} da_2 \int_0^{a_2} da_3\ \zeta_k^\dagger\zeta_k} \tag{4.3}$$

as a function of the variational parameter k. This provide us by the Rayleigh-Ritz theorem an upper bound of the ground state energy E of the system:

$$E < E(k_0), \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{dE(k)}{dk}\Big|_{k=k_0} = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

We also evaluate

$$E_0(k) = \frac{\int_0^\infty da_1 \int_0^{a_1} da_2 \int_0^{a_2} da_3 \; \zeta_k^\dagger (\hat{H}_0 \zeta_k)}{\int_0^\infty da_1 \int_0^{a_1} da_2 \int_0^{a_2} da_3 \; \zeta_k^\dagger \, \zeta_k} \tag{4.5}$$

and show that there exist certain choices of $\tan\theta$ for which $E_0(k_0) < 0$.

Near $\phi(a) = 0$, as both $\zeta_k \to 0$ and $\hat{H}\zeta_k \to 0$, the contribution to the integrals in (4.3) is very small from this region. Consequently, we can deform $E(k)$,

$$E(k) = \frac{\int_{2\epsilon}^\infty da_1 \int_\epsilon^{a_1-\epsilon} da_2 \int_0^{a_2-\epsilon} da_3 \zeta_k^\dagger (\hat{H}\zeta_k)}{\int_{2\epsilon}^\infty da_1 \int_\epsilon^{a_1-\epsilon} da_2 \int_0^{a_2-\epsilon} da_3 \zeta_k^\dagger \zeta_k}, \tag{4.6}$$

where ϵ is very small. This is done for the following reason. The integral in the numerator involves $\partial_i\phi(a)$ which does not have the same zeros as $\phi(a)$ and $\partial_i\phi(a)$ can be large even near $\phi(a) = 0$. The integral involves product of $\phi(a)$ and $\partial_i\phi(a)$'s and numerical evaluation might be erroneous because of multiplying a very small number (the zero of the computer) with a very large number .

We checked that as ϵ is reduced, the integrals converge and that it is enough to consider $\epsilon = 0.01$ for a good estimation of $E(k)$.

For $\tan\theta = 0$, $E_0(k)$ is monotonic and positive, while for $\cot\theta = 0$, $E_0(k)$ is monotonic and negative. Consequently, when we choose $0 < |\theta| \ll \frac{\pi}{2}$, the energy functional $E(k)$ can be positive and have a minima. On the other hand, for $0 \ll |\theta| < \frac{\pi}{2}$, there might be minima, but $E(k)$ might be negative.

In the following, we study the two regimes separately.

$0 < |\theta| \ll \frac{\pi}{2}$:

First, we consider $0 < |\theta| \ll \frac{\pi}{2}$ and estimate $E_0(k)$ and $E(k)$ numerically. For various values of θ and g, we have plotted $E(k)$ as a function of k in Fig. 1. The minima of $E(k)$ (as in the plots) give upper bounds of the total energy $E(k_0)$, which are positive such choices of θ. For various values of θ, $E(k_0)$ as a function of the coupling constant g is shown in Fig. 2.

For such choices of θ, due to the exponential factor in the modes ζ_{k_0}, they might localized near the $\phi(a) = 0$ boundary. That can be demonstrated by plotting $|\zeta_{k_0}|^2(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ as a function of a_1, a_2 and a_3 for fixed θ and g. In Fig. 3, we have shown the contour plots of $|\zeta_{k_0}|^2(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ for fixed a_1's in the range $a_2 \in [0, a_1]$ and $a_3 \in [0, a_2]$. The darker regions denote higher values of $|\zeta_{k_0}|^2$.

From the figures, we can see that when a_1 is small, $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3 \geq 0$ is the region close to the vertex of the the wedge-like region spanned by a_1, a_2 and a_3. We see that $|\zeta_{k_0}|^2$ is significantly large in this region. For larger a_1, $|\zeta_{k_0}|^2$ is localised near the $a_2 = a_3$ boundary (the diagonal lines in the boxes), $a_1 = a_2$ boundary (the right hand limits of the boxes) and near $a_1 = a_2 = a_3$ boundary (the top-right corners of the boxes), while in the interior region where the a_i's are distinctly different, $|\zeta_{k_0}|^2$ is significantly damped. Thus we conclude that ζ_{k_0} describes states localised near the $\phi(a) = 0$ boundary.



Figure 1: Plot of $E(k)$ as a function of k for various values of g with a fixed θ (left) and for various values of θ with a fixed g (right).



Figure 2: Plot of $E(k_0)$ as a function of g.

As $|\theta|$ decreases, the value of k_0 decreases which can be seen from Fig. 1. As a result, the exponential factor decays slowly for smaller $|\theta|$ and $|\zeta_{k_0}|^2$ spreads more into the bulk. This is consistent with the fact that there is no edge state at $\theta = 0$.

$0 \ll |\theta| < \frac{\pi}{2}$**:**

For a large value of $|\theta|$, we indeed find that $E(k)$ is negative. For various values of θ and g, we have plotted $E(k)$ as a function of k in Fig. 4.

Again, the minima gives the upper bound of the total energy $E(k_0)$. We have plotted $E(k_0)$ as a function of the coupling constant g for various values of θ in Fig. 5.

Again, if we plot $|\zeta_{k_0}|^2$ as a function of a_1, a_2 and a_3 (as in Fig. 3) for a fixed θ and g, we will find that the modes are localised near $\phi = 0$ boundary. So these are edge states but with negative energy

As $|\theta|$ increases towards $\frac{\pi}{2}$, k_0 decreases (as can be seen from Fig. 4). Consequently, the modes spread more into the bulk.

As glueballs are bosons, if such negative energy states exist, there is no Pauli exclusion principle to prevent states with arbitrary number of such edge localised glueballs with negative



Figure 3: Plot of $|\zeta_{k_0}|^2$ as a function of a_2 and a_3 for fixed values of a_1 and $\theta = -0.01$ radian. Here, we used $g = 0.8$ and $k_0 \approx 2.35$ which is obtained from the minima in Fig. 1 with $\theta = -0.01$ radian.

energies. Therefore, the energy will be unbounded from below and the vacuum will be unstable. Therefore, these edge states should be considered *unphysical*.

5 Negative Energy Edge states: A Possible Interpretation

In the previous section, we have shown that the total energy of the edge states in the matrix model can be negative. In a pure gauge theory, these negative energy states are unphysical. However, as we argue below, on inclusion of matter fields, these states can have positive energy and therefore, can exist.

A similar situation has been treated by Asorey et. al. [7, 8] for spin zero (and one) fields on a spatial disk $\mathcal{D}$ with boundary $\partial\mathcal{D}$. If $\hat{n}$ is the outward-drawn unit normal at $\partial\mathcal{D}$ and ∂_n



Figure 4: Plot of $E(k)$ as a function of k for various values of g with a fixed θ (left) and for various values of θ with a fixed g (right).



Figure 5: Plot of $E(k_0)$ as a function of g.

denotes $\hat{n}\cdot\vec{\nabla}$ at $\partial\mathcal{D}$, the scalar Laplacian $\Delta = -\sum_i \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}$ is (essentially self-adjoint for the Robin boundary conditions

$$(\Psi + i\partial_n\Psi)\Big|_{\partial\mathcal{D}} = e^{i\theta}(\Psi - i\partial_n\Psi)\Big|_{\partial\mathcal{D}}, \qquad e^{i\tilde{\theta}} \in U(1). \tag{5.1}$$

When $e^{i\tilde{\theta}} = 1$, (5.1) gives the Neumann boundary condition $\partial_n\Psi\Big|_{\partial\mathcal{D}} = 0$, while if $e^{i\tilde{\theta}} = -1$, it gives the Dirichlet boundary condition $\Psi\Big|_{\partial\mathcal{D}} = 0$. Near Dirichlet point, there are Robin boundary conditions

$$\Psi\Big|_{\partial\mathcal{D}} = \lambda\partial_n\Psi\Big|_{\partial\mathcal{D}}. \tag{5.2}$$

It is an important result of [7] that the Laplacian $-\sum_i \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}$ has edge-localised negative energy states if $\lambda > 0$. Hence, the free Laplacian $-\sum_i \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}$ cannot be second quantised.

But it was proved [8] that $-\sum_i \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}$ has a lower bound:

$$-\sum_i \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} \geq -m_0^2(\lambda). \tag{5.3}$$

Hence,

$$-\sum_i \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} + m_0^2(\lambda) \geq 0, \tag{5.4}$$

and the Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = -\phi^* \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_0^2} - \sum_i \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} - m_0^2(\lambda) \right) \phi \tag{5.5}$$

allows a consistent quantisation.

In addition, (5.5) is the Lagrangian for a superconductor. (For the latter, ϕ should be a vector field, but that is not important here). Further the field ϕ in the ground state decays as it enters $\mathcal{D}$ due to Meissner effect:

$$\phi = \phi_0 e^{-(r_0 - r)m_0^2(\lambda)} \tag{5.6}$$

near $\partial\mathcal{D}$, r decreasing away from the boundary. From (5.6), we get

$$\left(\phi - m_0^2(\lambda)\partial_r \phi\right)\Big|_{\partial\mathcal{D}} = 0. \tag{5.7}$$

This is (5.2) for $\lambda = m_0^2(\lambda)$.

Thus the negative energy levels signify the transition to the superconducting phase.

The wave functions Ψ vanishing at $\partial\mathcal{D}$ have nonnegative energies even without $m_0^2(\lambda)$:

$$\left(\Psi, -\sum_i \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}\Psi\right) = \left(\sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\Psi, \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\Psi\right) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } \Psi\Big|_{\partial\mathcal{D}} = 0. \tag{5.8}$$

Hence, with the addition of $m_0^2(\lambda)$, the edge states get lifted to positive energies (which can be adjusted to be low-lying), while bulk states get gapped, with bulk energies $> |m_0(\lambda)|$.

We conjecture that in the matrix model we discuss here, the presence of the negative energy edge states signals a phase transition in the same way. A mass term is generated which lifts the edge levels to positive energies and at the same time creates a gap in the bulk levels making them incompressible. As in [12], when fundamental fermions and scalar fields are coupled to the matrix model, indeed such a mass term can be generated. In such a massive gluon phase, the aforementioned edge states do exist.

The possibility of such "superconducting" and novel phases have been considered in the quark-gluon plasma phase of QCD [13, 14].

6 Edge States: Angular Momentum and Colour

The Schrödinger Hamiltonian on $\mathbb{R}^3$, on separation of variables, acquires the centrifugal term $\frac{l(l+1)}{r^2}$. This term eliminates the boundary condition ambiguities at $r = 0$ from all except the S-wave.

But it is a surprising result of Iwai (sections 3.3, 5.2 5.3 in [15])[3] that the induced potential in the Hamiltonian $H = \Delta + V(M)$ (see (2.22)) for colour or angular momentum states is *finite*

[3] This point was emphasised to us by Sachindeo Vaidya.

as $\phi(a) \to 0$. That means that edge states are present also with angular momentum and colour excitations.

Their energies will depend on angular momentum and colour because the induced potential depends on them. It will be interesting to study this energy dependence on angular momentum and colour.

Acknowledgements
We are grateful to Manuel Asorey for extensive collaboration and his help in preparing the manuscript. This work is the continuation of the collaborative work done by A.P.B.with Sachin Vaidya and Amilcar Queiroz. He has benefited from many discussions with Sachin and also with Professor M. S. Narasimhan. This work has been partially supported by the grants FPA2015-65745-P (MINECO/FEDER) and DGA-FSE 2015-E24/2

References

[1] V. N. Gribov, *Instability of Nonabelian Gauge Theories and Impossibility of Choice of Coulomb Gauge*, In *Nyiri, J. (ed.): The Gribov theory of quark confinement* 24-38

[2] I. M. Singer, *Some Remarks on the Gribov Ambiguity*, Commun. Math. Phys. **60**, 7 (1978).

[3] M. S. Narasimhan and T. R. Ramadas, *Geometry Of Su(2) Gauge Fields*, Commun. Math. Phys. **67**, 121 (1979).

[4] A. P. Balachandran, A. de Queiroz and S. Vaidya, *A matrix model for QCD: QCD color is mixed*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **30**, no. 09, 1550064 (2015) [arXiv:1407.8352 [hep-th]].

[5] A. P. Balachandran, S. Vaidya and A. R. de Queiroz, *A Matrix Model for QCD*, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **30**, no. 16, 1550080 (2015) [arXiv:1412.7900 [hep-th]].

[6] J. G. Esteve, *Anomalies in Conservation Laws in the Hamiltonian Formalism*, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 674 (1986).

[7] M. Asorey, A. P. Balachandran and J. M. Pérez-Pardo, *Edge States: Topological Insulators, Superconductors and QCD Chiral Bags* JHEP **1312** (2013) 073 [arXiv:1308.5635 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci]].

[8] M. Asorey, A. P. Balachandran and J. M. Perez-Pardo, *Edge States at Phase Boundaries and Their Stability*, Rev. Math. Phys. **28**, no. 09, 1650020 (2016) [arXiv:1505.03461 [math-ph]].

[9] M. Ninomiya and C. I. Tan, *Axial Anomaly and Index Theorem for Manifolds With Boundary*, Nucl. Phys. B **257**, 199 (1985) Erratum: [Nucl. Phys. B **266**, 748 (1986)].

[10] N. Acharyya, M. Asorey, A. P. Balachandran and S. Vaidya, *Supersymmetry: Boundary Conditions and Edge States*, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 10, 105016 (2015) [arXiv:1501.00634 [hep-th]].

[11] N. Acharyya, A. P. Balachandran, V. E. Díez, P. N. B. Subramanian and S. Vaidya, *BRST Symmetry: Boundary Conditions and Edge States in QED* , arXiv:1604.03696 [hep-th].

[12] M. Pandey and S. Vaidya, it Quantum Phases of Yang-Mills Matrix Model Coupled to Fundamental Fermions, arXiv:1606.05466 [hep-th].

[13] A. P. Balachandran, S. Digal and T. Matsuura, *Semi-superfluid strings in high density QCD*, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 074009 (2006) [hep-ph/0509276].

[14] A. P. Balachandran and S. Digal, *NonAbelian topological strings and metastable states in linear sigma model*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 034018 (2002) [hep-ph/0204262].

[15] T. Iwai, *Classical and quantum mechanics of a pseudo-rigid body in three dimensions*, J.Phys.,A 43, 415204 (2010).

[16] E.A. Coddington and N. Levinson, *Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations*, McGraw-Hill (1955)

[17] N. Acharyya, A. P. Balachandran, S. Sanyal and S. Vaidya, *Glueball Spectra from a Matrix Model of Pure Yang-Mills Theory*, arXiv:1606.08711 [hep-th].

[18] A. P. Balachandran, G. Marmo, B. S. Skagerstam and A. Stern, *Classical topology and quantum states* , World Scientific Singapore (1991).

[19] K. Gawędzki, A. Kupiainen, $SU(2)$ *Chern-Simons theory at genus zero*, Comm. Math. Phys. 135 (1991), 531–546.

[20] F. Falceto, K. Gawędzki, *Chern-Simons states at genus one*, Comm. Math. Phys. 159 (1994), 549–579.

[21] M. Asorey, F. Falceto, J. L. Lopez and G. Luzon, *Nodes, monopoles and confinement in (2+1)-dimensional gauge theories*, Phys. Lett. B **349**, 125 (1995) [hep-th/9502024].

[22] M. Asorey, F. Falceto, J. L. Lopez, G. Luzon, Banach Center Pubs., **39** (1997) 183–199.

[23] M. Asorey and A. Santagata, *Instability of Coulomb phase in QCD*, PoS (Confinement X) 057 (2012).

[24] M. Asorey and A. Santagata, *Singular potentials: Confinement and Riemann hypothesis*, Il Nuovo Cimento C 36 (2013) 03; A. Santagata, Ph. D. Dissertation, U. Zaragoza (2014).

[25] M. Asorey and A. Santagata, *Coulomb phase stability and quark confinement*, PoS(QCD-TNT-III,) 004 (2014)

[26] M. Asorey and A. Santagata, *Instabilities of Coulomb phases and quark confinement in QCD*, AIP Conf. Proc. 1606 (2014) 406

[27] H. Weyl, Ann. of Math., 36, 230-254 (1935)

[28] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics Volume 2*, Academic Press, Inc., (1975)

[29] A. W. Knapp, *Representation Theory of Semi-simple Groups*, Princeton University Press (1986)

[30] M. Asorey, A. Ibort and G. Marmo, *Global theory of quantum boundary conditions and topology change*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **20**, 1001 (2005) [hep-th/0403048].